2003P00148WOUS Gerhard Jonke et al.

REMARKS

Claim Status

After entry of this Amendment, Claims 1 - 18 are pending. By this Amendment, Applicants amend Claim 1. No new matter is added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Yoriki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,640,431). Hence, the Examiner asserts that Yoriki discloses each and every limitation, for example, of the multiple insertion head defined in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse.

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner repeats the arguments of the previous Office Action mailed January 24, 2006. In response to Applicants' arguments, however, the Examiner notes that Claim 1 is "so broad that it only requires that the receiving tool is provided with at least one active drive and sensor," and that "Yoriki discloses that the receiving tool is coupled to a drive or sensor at a certain rotational position."

It appears that the Examiner's assertion is based on the "provided with" language of Claim 1. Even though Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion, Claim 1 is amended to expedite examination and allowance of the present application. Amended Claim 1 specifies that each receiving tool has at least one of an active drive and sensor.

Further, the Examiner responds that the features upon which Applicants rely (i.e., each receiving tool can be moved and controlled individually, and components can be mounted independently of external actuators) are not recited in the rejected claims. Claim 1 is amended to further specify that each receiving tool is configured to be moved and controlled individually, and that components can be mounted independently of external actuators.

These amendments to Claim 1 further distinguish the claimed subject matter over Yoriki, and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. However, for the sake of completeness, Applicants discuss hereinafter Yoriki and the remaining rejections.

As discussed in Applicants' response of May 2, 2006, and confirmed by the Examiner, Yoriki discloses that only the receiving tool at a certain rotational position

is coupled to a drive or sensor. The drives/actuators and sensors are stationary at certain rotational positions of the receiving tools. However, none of the receiving tools has its own active drive and/or sensor, as defined in amended Claim 1.

For support of this conclusion, Applicants refer to arguments filed the May 2, 2006. These arguments are repeated herewith.

Further, amended Claim 1 specifies that each receiving tool is configured to be moved and controlled individually, and that components can be mounted independently of external actuators. As discussed, Yoriki does not disclose or suggest that each receiving tool has its own active drive and/or sensor. Accordingly, each receiving tool can be moved and controlled individually, and components can be mounted independently of external actuators, as defined in amended Claim 1. This improves the mounting precision because coupling or uncoupling of external actuators is not necessary. (See, e.g., page 2, line 31, to page 3, line 3.)

Yoriki, as understood by Applicants, discloses an EC mounting apparatus with mounting heads that appears to be similar to the placement systems discussed in the introductory part of the present application, e.g., on page 1, line 16-31. Yoriki, as such and absent the above-discussed features, does not achieve the advantages achieved by the insertion head defined in amended Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Yoriki at least fails to disclose or suggest a multiple insertion head wherein each receiving tool has at least one of an active drive and sensor. Therefore, Yoriki does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation recited in amended Claim 1, and, consequently, does not anticipate the subject matter of amended Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and to pass amended Claim 1 to allowance.

Claims 2-18 depend from Claim 1. For this reason and because of the additional features recited in the dependent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Yoriki does not anticipate Claims 2-18. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass Claims 2-18 to allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner rejects dependent Claims 4-5 as being unpatentable over Yoriki in view of Gieskes (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0074085

2003P00148WOUS Gerhard Jonke et al.

A1), and Claims 9 - 13 as being unpatentable over Yorkiki in view of Asai (U.S. Patent No. 5,588,195). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 4-5 and 9-13 depend from Claim 1. The above arguments are repeated herein. Gieskes or Asai do not provide the missing teachings in Yoriki to anticipate nor render obvious Claim 1. Accordingly, at least for the above reasons, Claims 4-5 and 9-13 are also allowable and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present response is intended to correspond with the Revised Amendment Format. Should any part of the present response not be in full compliance with the requirements of the Revised Amendment Format, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned for immediate correction.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is herewith respectfully requested.

Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' attorney in order to resolve such issues promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to <u>Deposit Account No. 502464</u> referencing attorney docket number 2003P00148WOUS.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/27/06

14 / 11/km

John P. Musone Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 44,961 Tel: (407) 736 6449

Customer No.: 28204